

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | · | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/539,872 | 12/21/2005 | | Nancy Hathaway | 21309YP | 6359 |
| 210 MERCK AND | | 2/28/2007 | | EXAMINER | |
| P O BOX 2000 | | | | KAROL, JODY LYNN | |
| RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 1617 | • |
| | | | | | • |
| • | | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | | 12/28/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| • | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| •) | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | 10/539,872 | HATHAWAY ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Jody L. Karol | 1617 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Ju | une 2005. | | | | | |
| ·_ · | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowa | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or | wn from consideration. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11. | epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | _ | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | ate | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- 1. Antiparkinson agents (i.e. doxepin, pergolide, or levodopa).
- 2. A second antiparkinson agent. (a selective cors-zinhib tor)

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The applicant must identify a single anticholinergic agent, a single dopaminergic agent, a single monoamine oxidase agent, or amantadine as the first elected species, and a single second agent as the second elected species. The election of anticholinergic agent, dopaminergic agent, or monoamine oxidase agent in general is not sufficient. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

2. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Claims 2-3 - amantadine

Claim 4 - benzotropine, biperidan, procyclidine, trihexphenidyl

Claim 5 - diphenhydramine, orphenadrine

Claim 6 – amitriptyline, doxepin, imipramine, nortriptyline

Claim 8 – levodopa, bromocriptine, pergolide, pramipexole, cabergoline, or ropinerole

Claim 9 - selegiline

The following claim(s) are generic: 1, 7, 10-20.

3. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the different species of antiparkinson agents are known in the art. Several of these compounds are listed in Shapiro et al. (US 5,688,117) as treatment for Parkinson's disease, such as amitryptyline, levodopa, or orphenadrine (see Example 1 at column 28).

Furthermore, the antiparkinson agents are independent or distinct because claims to different species recite mutually exclusive characteristics of the species (i.e. an antihistamine compared to a monoamine oxidase agent). In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of

search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Inventorship Notice

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jody L. Karol whose telephone number is (571) 270-3283. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm Mon-Fri EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JLK

SREENI PADMANABHAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER